

4930  
A  
FREE ADDRESS

TO

THOSE WHO HAVE PETITIONED

FOR THE

REPEAL of the late ACT of PARLIAMENT,

IN FAVOUR OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLICS.

R

---

By A LOVER OF PEACE AND TRUTH.

---

*But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you Matt. v. 44.*

---

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. JOHNSON, No. 72, St. Paul's Church Yard, 1780.

(Price Two-pence, or Twelve Shillings per Hundred to give away.)



---

A

## FREE ADDRESS, &c.

*My Countrymen and Fellow Protestants,*

**P**ERMIT one, who hopes he feels the same ardour with which you are inspired, in the cause of Religion, of Christianity, and of Protestantism, to expostulate with you, with some degree of freedom, on the manner in which your zeal has lately operated.

Far am I from wishing that you had less zeal than you have shewn. On the contrary, it gives me the sincerest pleasure to find that, amidst all our complaints of the dissipation and vices of the age, sentiments of religion appear to be so deeply rooted in the minds of numbers, as to make them unawed by civil power, and regardless of all political parties. I only wish to suggest to you, that the same zeal, exerted in a different manner, a manner more suitable to the genius of that religion, and that form of it, for which you are contending, will much more effectually secure your great object.

What I earnestly wish is, that you would consider Christianity and Protestantism with more respect, than to imagine that they stand in need of any aid from civil power to support them. The

kingdom of our Lord is *not of this world*, and wants not such supports as the kingdoms of this world require, viz. rigorous laws, and a severe administration. Christianity addresses itself only to the *understandings* and *hearts* of men ; and, if *persuasion* fail, it leaves every man to the judgment of that God, who has given to all of us whatever talents and advantages of any kind we are possessed of ; and who will not fail to exact a sufficiently strict account of the use we shall have made of them.

Had not our Saviour himself power enough to have established his religion in whatever manner he had pleased ? Could not he who stilled a tempest, fed multitudes by miracles, blasted the barren fig-tree, and cleared the temple of those who had converted it into a house of merchandize, have, if he had pleased, contented himself with making a solemn proclamation of his religion, and have punished, with fines, imprisonment, or instant death, all who should have refused to embrace it ? And might he not have urged every thing that, at any time since, has been urged in favour of such coercive measures, viz. that it was all for the *good of mens souls*, and to prevent others from being perverted by those who persisted in their infidelity.

Whereas, on the contrary, he did not exert his miraculous power even to save his own life. His father, he expressly says, would, on his request, have sent him legions of angels to rescue him from the hands of his enemies ; but he wisely declined making any such improper use of that power, or of *any* power. For when Peter, out of a real affection for his master, and an attachment to his cause



cause as great as you yourselves can now feel, drew his sword, and smote one of those who were sent to apprehend him, he instantly restrained his impetuosity; adding an awful warning to all who should hereafter have recourse to any similar means in the cause of his gospel, viz. *All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.* And have we not seen this prophecy fulfilled in every period of the Christian church to the present times?

When did any man, or body of men, ever rise up in arms, in defence of their religion and religious privileges, and prosper? What could be more promising than the affairs of the Hussites in some periods of their war with the emperor, or those of the Protestants in France against their sovereigns? But how miserably, in the just providence of God, did that recourse to arms fail them both? In what did the final catastrophe differ from that of the Crusades? And no better, we may venture to foretel, will be the success of all other attempts to gain any advantages to Christianity by force.

And if it be unlawful to use *defensive* arms in the cause of religion, much more must it be so to use *offensive* ones, for which there is much less excuse. If our religion be of any value, it is so because it is *true*, and *evidently so*. It is nothing but the persuasion of its being true that can ever make it *respected*, and influence mens *hearts* and *conduct*, which is the only object of Christianity, and least of all to make men hypocrites, professing to believe what they dare not profess to disbelieve, which is all that *power*, in its own nature, can ever do.

Do but reflect on the manner in which Christianity got the footing that it has in the world. Was it by the help of *civil laws* and their *sanctions*? On the contrary, it is notorious, that for near three hundred years, all that civil laws and their sanctions could do, were employed against it, but in vain. It made its way through the whole Roman empire, a more formidable power than has since existed in the world, in spite of its fashces, fire, torture, and death in every form that could be devised.

Now, can there be the least probability in the supposition, that a religion which established itself in the world in spite of all civil power, should stand in need of the same power merely to *preserve* itself? Common sense revolts at the idea. It must be something else than Christianity, some *evil corruption* or *abuse* of it, something that men can never be *persuaded* to adopt, that has recourse to such assistance.

What is the most obvious objection to the Mahometan religion, but that it was propagated by the sword? And what is it that makes us revolt so much as we do at the usurpations of the church of Rome, but that it is a bloody persecuting church? And shall we imitate that church in the very thing for which we most condemn it? We cannot do it without incurring a greater odium ourselves. We thereby fix the same mark of suspicion on our own cause that we think so glaring in theirs.

If we read the history of persecution, we shall be satisfied that it was never employed in favour of *pure Christianity*, or conducted with a *Christian spirit*. In the church of Rome, all Protestants agree,

agree, it was to enforce something as absurd as paganism itself; and the temper with which it was always conducted, was in no respect different from that of Nero or Dioclesian. If the church of England has persecuted, it behoves her to consider whether it has been for the *essentials* of Christianity, or for some improper *appendage* to it; and whether the coercive measures she has had recourse to would have been so severe, if all worldly *power* and *emolument* had been out of the question. The same queries may likewise be put with respect to the Presbyterians of the last century. The Quakers are perhaps the only body of Christians who stand unquestionably clear of this charge.

The best that can be said of any persecutors is that which was said of the Jews, that *they had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge*. Paul was also actuated, before his conversion, by the same zeal; but he sufficiently condemns himself for it; and he acted a very different part, and breathed a very different spirit afterwards, and yet without having less zeal than before.

Our Saviour himself forewarned his disciples, that *they who killed them would think that they did God service*. But did he acquit them of all blame on that account? Or did he give the least intimation that a zeal for God ought to carry his own followers to the same lengths? We are to shew our zeal and fortitude by *suffering* for our religion, not by fighting for it; because suffering in a cause shews the firmness of our persuasion concerning its truth, which is adapted to work on the minds of others. Christ himself conquered by his cross, and so must we, if we be his followers. There

is no other victory that is truly *Christian*. It was prophesied of him, that he should not *shout nor cry, nor make his voice to be heard in the streets*; in so gentle and unimposing a way did he proceed. How different, I need not say, from the conduct of many on a late occasion.

But, independent of the peculiar spirit of Christianity, which the best of us are too apt to lose sight of, let us consider our conduct as that of men to men, who have equal zeal for their respective tenets, and may have equal power. Can we coerce others without vindicating those who coerce us, without setting them an example, and therefore, in fact, urging them to proceed in the same manner.

Protestants should not forget that there still are, as well as have been, Papists; and though their power be happily at an end in this country, it subsists in its full force abroad, and in countries where there are Protestants. And in several countries where the government is Popish, there are more Protestants than there are Papists here. At the same time, therefore, that Protestants are as much under the power of Papists there, as Papists are under the power of Protestants here, the plea of *danger* from them may be more plausibly alledged. While, therefore, you are demolishing the houses, property, and churches of Papists here, you are urging the Papists to demolish the houses, property, and churches of the Protestants abroad. That is, you are in fact doing it yourselves; and you may be thankful if you do not hear of such outrages being actually committed by Papists upon Protestants in foreign countries. Their zeal, and consequently



requently their indignation, is not less than yours: and it is not your opinion that they have more Christian meekness and forbearance.

If then you would know how you should behave to Papists here, the answer is obvious, viz. in the very same manner in which you would have Papists behave to Protestants abroad. You should shew the favour you wish to receive, and forbear as you wish to be forborne with yourselves.

To charge sectaries with *disaffection to government*, and to affect an apprehension of danger to the state from them, have been the pleas of all established churches, as a justification of the severities they used towards them. This has been alledged by Papists with respect to Protestants in foreign countries, and by the church of England with respect to the Dissenters in this; though without any foundation, except that degree of alienation on one side, which is produced by *ill treatment* on the other, and which it is, therefore, always in the power of the superior party to put an end to.

You will reply, as I am well aware, that I overcharge the picture. You are no advocates, you say, for *persecuting* the Papists; and that you who associated for the purpose of getting a repeal of the late act in favour of Popery, were not the persons who burned houses, demolished the public prisons, and let a number of desperate banditti loose upon the public. I am willing to hope that this may have been the case. But still in the very soliciting of the repeal of that act, you applied to the civil authority for power to lay persons professing the Roman Catholic religion under

such restrictions, and to expose them to such penalties as you would be very sorry that you yourselves should lie under, and be exposed to, if Divine Providence had fixed your abode in a Popish country.

The law you have taken so much offence at, only gave Papists leave to purchase lands, and took off some very severe and injudicious penalties, which put them in the power of mercenary informers, for performing acts of their religion, or teaching school. It by no means authorised the public exercise of that religion, nor did it give them any power to teach school at all. It is still a hundred pounds penalty and imprisonment for a year, to read or hear mass, and it is death to make a convert to the Popish religion; and this is much more than the civil power does with respect to Christianity in Turkey. There Christians may reside unmolested, and exercise every thing belonging to their religion, in the most public manner, and educate their children as they please, on paying a certain tax, though it is death to attempt to make a convert of any Mahometan. Shall the professors of the different modes of the same religion be more inveterate against each other than Mahometans are against any of us? Alas! our conduct towards each other, would justify a much more rigorous treatment of us all.

You reply, that *any* indulgence shows the good-will that government bears them, and will encourage them to presume upon farther favour. This, I own, is natural. But if, by their peaceable behaviour, they shall appear to have *deserved* farther indulgence, why should it not be granted them?

them? Would you not think this a reasonable thing in your own case, if you lived in France?

You say that Popery is favourable to *arbitrary power*, and that the favour the court shews them is a proof of their being unfriendly to the civil liberties of this country, and that this circumstance has been the cause of the late act, and of all that has of late been done in favour of the Papists. But the liberal-minded in the opposition were as much friends to the bill, at the time of its passing, as any in the administration, and even took a more active part in promoting it. Admitting all that you alledge, we ought to rejoice, if, from *any* principle, men do what is in itself right. It is usual in the course of Divine Providence for good to come out of evil, for men to mean one thing, and God, whose instruments they are, another.

It is, however, by no means true that Popery, as such, is hostile to civil liberty, though of late it has happened to be so in this country. Was not all Europe Catholic some centuries ago? But were the princes more despotic, or the people more abject slaves than they are now? The contrary is known to be the case. Was there no spirit of liberty in England before the Reformation? Are there not now Popish Swiss Cantons, as well as Protestant ones? and for any thing that I know to the contrary, they are equally zealous republicans, and would with equal reluctance submit to a foreign power, merely because it was a catholic one. Their noblest exertions in favour of their liberties were in an age long preceeding the reformation.

Had there been any thing peculiarly unfavourable to civil liberty, or even to republicanism, in

the Popish religion it might have been expected to have appeared in Maryland during the present troubles in America. But the people of that province, though almost universally Catholics, entertained as quick a resentment of the wrongs they supposed their country to have received from this, as those of any other province on the continent; and we have not found that, at this day, this government has more friends there than elsewhere. Like any other province, their deputies sit in Congress, and are as hearty in the common cause as any other members of that body.

Even the Quebec bill, by which Popery was very injudiciously established in Canada, is now well known not to have procured this government any friends there, except a very few noblesse and the priests. The common people have always shewn a disposition to favour the Americans, and earnestly wish for a repeal of that act.

In this country we make the Papists our enemies by becoming theirs. If we would make them friends, we must, as they are in our power, first act a friendly part towards them. Remove all the restrictions they are under, and then assign any reason, if you can, why they should not be as much attached to this country, and the government of it, as any other subjects. If they were made perfectly easy with respect to their religion, and their civil rights, what could they have more under a Popish prince? And depend upon it, that, being men like ourselves, and having lived in a free country, they know the value of civil liberty as much as you do, and would risk as much for it.

They



They cannot themselves imagine that there is the least probability of the Papists becoming the most numerous class of people in this country; and therefore the re-establishment of Popery and the subjection of the Protestants, is a thing too chimerical for them to entertain any idea of. A free toleration, therefore, in this country, is all that they can even hope for. Besides, there is no Popish prince whose pretensions to the crown of England deserve the least notice. The idea is abandoned both here and abroad. And if our own sovereign change his religion, and become a Papist, he immediately forfeits his right to the next protestant heir.

Much of the intemperate heat that has been shewn on this occasion, has, I doubt not, arisen from your having read the histories of Popish persecutions, and of the treachery and cruelty of Papists to Protestants in former times; and the popular cry is, that *Popery is not changed*, but that it is the same faithless bloody religion that it ever was. But I would beg leave to observe, that in all ages persecution has often been carried on with merely political views, or from some misapprehension of danger to the state from sectaries; and also, that, in all ages, there have not been wanting great numbers of zealous Catholics in other respects, who have abhorred persecution as much as any Protestant, and who would have been as much shocked at the thought of imbruing their hands in blood, or of deceiving their neighbour to his hurt. I have no doubt but that these just and humane sentiments are become very general, if not universal, among Papists, especially those in England.

If Popery be unchanged in the course of the last century, which has produced so great a revolution in European manners, I will venture to say it is the only thing that is so; and that nothing less than a miracle can have exempted it from the power of those influences, which have not failed to produce a change in every thing else. It may be true that no *authoritative alterations* have been made in its canons. But when time and reflection changes *men*, their *institutions*, their *customs* and *conduct* will, in some way or other, change with them.

The church of England is, in itself, the same thing that it was in the time of queen Elizabeth; but were all the laws against the Dissenters now in force (as they were with respect to many of them 'till lately, and some of them remain to this day) would any person be in fear of seeing them *executed* with the same rigour that they were in the reign of Elizabeth, or those of the Stuarts? And are not the Dissenters of the present age very different from what they were in the same period? The same must, from the nature of things, be the case with the Papists, because they are *men* as well as ourselves. For my own part, in England or abroad, I could sleep with the same security under the roof of a Papist as under that of a Protestant of any denomination whatever, if my host was a man of equally good character in other respects.

As to the abominable maxims of the Jesuits, we should not forget that they were first, and most effectually decried by the Papists themselves, especially by the celebrated Pascal, in his *Provincial Letters*. Are not the Catholics in England men who are as fair in their dealings, and as  
 gene-

generous in their conduct, as other people? And if they were so very treacherous and faithless as many persons imagine them to be, why have they not long ago emancipated themselves from all our restrictions, by taking the oaths that other people take? If it is their opinion that the Pope can absolve them from the obligation of such oaths, they have been great fools not to have availed themselves of it. Oaths, declarations, and subscriptions give men access to every thing in this country; but, in the nature of things, they cannot be any tie except on the *honest* and *conscientious*. The Papists, therefore, not taking this advantage, is the clearest proof imaginable, both that they are honest and conscientious, and that they do not believe in the dispensing power of the Pope, as is commonly imagined.

Much, you think, is to be dreaded from the known *zeal* of Papists to increase their party. But it is paying yourselves a very ill compliment to suppose, that there is less zeal in Protestants to counteract the effects of theirs. To zeal should be opposed *zeal*, not *acts of parliament*, or *outward force*. If, instead of employing your zeal, as you have done, in soliciting acts of parliament, procuring petitions for that purpose, and acting as spies upon Papists, in order to detect them in the exercise of their religion, and punish them for it (to say nothing of burning their houses and places of worship) if, I say, instead of employing your zeal in this manner, in which, from the nature of the thing, much bad passion, hatred, and malice, will necessarily mix themselves, you had acted as the apostle did when inspired with zeal in propagating the gospel, viz. *teaching from house to house, being constant in season and out of season, in meek-*

*meekness instructing those who opposed themselves, disputing publicly* where necessary, and shewing upon all occasions an example of a more Christian temper, especially the most perfect goodwill and affection to those who were unhappily intangled in error; you might with much more confidence have looked up to God for a blessing on your labours; and you would certainly, in the natural course of things, have done much more towards preventing the growth of Popery, than you are likely to do at present. The *mind* of man (and that alone is the thing which, in this case, you have to do with) naturally yields to gentleness, and opposes itself to constraint.

Had this method been adopted in the time of William and Mary, instead of enacting the coercive laws which are now the subject of general discussion, the number of Papists in this country would now, I am confident, have been very few. And at present, notwithstanding the difference has been kept up by every thing that can work that way, and the Popish priests are continually urging one of the most powerful of all motives, viz. that we dare not trust our cause to simple and fair argument, and that they are obliged to conceal much of the lustre and peculiar charms of their religion; it cannot be supposed that the Papists are more than one in a hundred to the Protestants. And of late years, in which there has been more of *connivance*, if not of *proper toleration*, it is clear to me that their number is much decreased, and that the accounts which have been so industriously propagated to the contrary, are an imposition on the public. Now what can men in their senses have to dread from one in a hundred



in the community, separated from one another, and connected by friendship and consanguinity with the Protestants, as the Papists among us are; even supposing, what by no means appears to be the case, and what is extremely improbable in itself, that they are ever so hostile to the rest of their countrymen.

It is well known to all who are acquainted with foreign countries, that it is with difficulty that Popery holds up its head, where there is any opportunity for *free inquiry*, and consequently any degree of learning or knowledge. It would, therefore, be perfectly miraculous, if, at the same time, it should be increasing and gaining strength in this country.

As to the claims of the Popes in *temporal matters*, they were never admitted in many catholic countries at any time, not even in the darkest ages; they were never acknowledged at all but for particular political purposes; and they have now been long universally exploded. Even in *spirituals*, the power of the Pope is very little in France, and his personal infallibility is, I believe, no where allowed. I even question whether it is pretended to in Rome itself. In these circumstances, instead of seeing reason to call for more *restraints*, now seems to be the time when the greatest *indulgence* ought, in good policy, to be given to Papists. They can never more become formidable, and they may be effectually gained by it.

For my own part, I sincerely wish the Papists might have full liberty to display, in all its splendour, the whole of their religion, that our people might be satisfied that they had seen the whole of it, and that there was not, as they may now suppose,

suppose, something better than any thing they had seen kept out of sight. Their processions should pass through the streets of London unmolested by me ; and I would trust to the good sense of Englishmen, that they would no more be tempted to fall down before a God of *paste*, in the shape of a round wafer, than before an image of wood or stone. The spectacle would certainly excite their ridicule, not their devotion. This I think I could be answerable for with respect to all Dissenters and Quakers. As to the members of the church of England, let the clergy speak.

Those of you who think there is something peculiarly enchanting in the *trappings of Popery*, should consider that this is but an imperfect imitation of the pomp and splendour of the ancient heathen religions, from which all the Popish ceremonies were borrowed ; and that all this fell before the simple religion of Jesus, at a time when it had no ornaments at all, but was as naked of all pomp and ceremony as that of the old Puritans or modern Methodists. The primitive Christians do not appear to have been under any apprehension about the effect of this pomp and show. It was a topic of ridicule with them, and so would the Popish ceremonies be with us ; and as little should we have to dread from them, provided that, like the primitive Christians, we were assiduous in giving the common people rational information.

That the *common people* must have something of show and splendour to strike their imaginations, is a mere modern prejudice, unsupported by any fact. The great body of the early Christians were exactly such common people as are supposed to be most struck with this show ; and yet they readily abandoned

abandoned all show, and many things more tempting than show, for a religion merely rational in its principles ; and they submitted to the greatest hardships for their adherence to it. All the reformati<sup>o</sup>ns from Popery were made by *plain people*, in fact disgusted with the folly of such splendour. And when men have once abandoned these things, can there be any danger of their wishing to return to them ? The Dissenters in general neither have nor want any allurements of this kind ; the Methodists have nothing to charm them in this way, besides mere psalm-singing ; and the Quakers, as compact a body of Christians as any, have not even that.

Many of you seem to be more particularly alarmed at the idea of the Papists having schools, which, however, the late act did not authorize them to have. But is there any right more clearly founded in nature, than that of parents educating their own children, or of chusing instructors for them ? For my own part I had much rather have no children at all, or be obliged to throw them into the Thames as soon as they were born, than have them on any other terms. Other parents have always felt in the same manner ; and accordingly history rings with the loudest complaints whenever this natural right has been infringed, as it has been in the case of some Protestants abroad, and of the Jews in former periods.

But admitting that Papists, would keep *open* schools, and receive all the children and youth that were brought to them, they cannot, in this country, *compel* any parents to send them their children. If they have zeal enough to teach *gratis*, let it be counteracted, as it naturally ought, by



by equal zeal on the part of Protestants. Let them teach gratis also, and invite the children of Papists; and not be like the dog in the manger, neither do so good a deed themselves, nor suffer others to do it.

We have already seen enough, I should think, of the mischief of restraining Papists in the education of their children in time past. The consequence has been, that having no provision for education, and especially for liberal education, at home, they have been obliged to send their children to foreign seminaries, where they unavoidably acquired a thorough aversion to the constitution and principles of the English government, which is so hostile to them. Whereas, had they been educated at home, they would have been exactly in the case of other Dissenters from the established church, as zealous for our free constitution and government as any other persons born in the country, and enjoying the advantages of it: and they would have respected the established church more or less, as they should have been treated by it.

This would take place more effectually if our universities had not adopted the narrow and ill-judged policy of excluding from the advantages of education there, all who cannot subscribe to the articles of the church of England; though, to secure this point, they oblige students to do it at an age in which it is impossible that they should have any understanding of what they subscribe.

Another evil that has arisen in a great measure from Papists being obliged to send their children abroad for education, is that the accounts brought to England of the cheapness and other advantages  
of



of that education, have induced many Protestants to send their children to Popish seminaries, from which many return much less zealous Protestants, and some absolute converts to Popery. Whereas the contrary practice of admitting Papists into our universities would necessarily have been the reverse of this, viz. lessening the bigotry of them all, and making many converts to Protestantism. But this is only one case out of many, in which, by the righteous providence of God, bad policy defeats its own ends.

To conclude ; Let us not terrify ourselves, and especially into acts of inhumanity and wickedness, by mere chimeras of our own brain. Let us strictly adhere to the golden rule of the gospel, a rule of universal application, viz. *to do to all others as we would that they should do to us*. Let us consider how we would wish to be treated in Popish countries, and make that the rule of our conduct to Papists in this. Let us by all means ever do what is *right* and *good*, and trust in the providence of God for all the consequences.

If we be Christians, and act upon truly Christian maxims, we shall do even more than this. We must *love our enemies*, and *overcome evil with good*. Let us then *study the things that make for peace, live in love and peace* with all with whom we have any intercourse, *and the God of love and peace will be with us*.

If you suspect the writer of this Address to be either a Papist, or to have particular friendships and connections with Papists, you are much mistaken. My religious principles are at least, as far removed from those of the church of Rome as those of any of you whom I am addressing. I believe

lieve Popery to be the most considerable part (not the whole) of that *Antichrist* which God will destroy in his own time, and the destruction of which he has begun to accomplish already. But *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God*. Whatever it be that opposes the kingdom of his Son, it will sooner fall if it be left to itself, and be assailed by nothing but *the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God*, than by any exertion of human force.

✓ In the mean time, I stand in need of liberty myself, and I wish that every creature of God may enjoy it equally with myself. *May his will be done on earth as it is in heaven*; i. e. voluntarily, and chearfully; and may we by our humane, rational, and Christian treatment, triumph over the minds, and not, by the aid of civil power, over the persons and properties of our deluded fellow-citizens.

I am,

My Protestant brethren, and fellow citizens,

Your's in the Faith, Hope, and Spirit of the  
Gospel,

June, 1780.

*A Lover of Peace and Truth.*

*A PARABLE against Persecution, from the  
Miscellaneous Works of Dr. FRANKLIN,  
p. 72.*

1. **A**ND it came to pass after these things, that Abraham sat in the door of his tent, about the going down of the sun. And behold a man bent with age, coming from the way of the wilderness leaning on a staff.

2. And Abraham arose, and met him, and said unto him, Turn in, I pray thee, and wash thy feet, and tarry all night; and thou shalt arise early in the morning, and go on thy way.

3. And the man said, Nay; for I will abide under this tree.

4. But Abraham pressed him greatly: so he turned and they went into the tent: and Abraham baked unleaven bread, and they did eat.

5. And when Abraham saw that the man blessed not God, he said unto him, Wherefore dost thou not worship the most high God, Creator of heaven and earth?

6. And the man answered and said, I do not worship thy God, neither do I call upon his name; for I have made to myself a God, which abideth always in my house, and provideth me with all things.

7. And Abraham's zeal was kindled against the man, and he arose, and fell upon him, and drove him forth with blows into the wilderness.

8. And God called unto Abraham, saying, Abraham where is the stranger?

9. And Abraham answered and said, Lord, he would not worship thee, neither would he call  
upon



upon thy name ; therefore have I driven him out from before my face into the wilderness.

10. And God said, have I borne with him these hundred and ninety and eight years, and nourished him, and clothed him, notwithstanding his rebellion against me ; and couldst not thou, who art thyself a sinner, bear with him one night ?

7 JU 66

---

*This Day is published, Price 2d. or 12s. per  
Hundred to give away,*

Printed on a broad Sheet, to be hung up in Halls,  
Compting-Houses, Warehouses, Workshops,  
Kitchens, and on Country Church Doors, &c.

## THE WAY to WEALTH,

OR POOR RICHARD'S PRECEPTS, recommending  
Industry, Frugality, and an Attention to one's  
own Affairs.

Printed for J. JOHNSON, No. 72, St. Paul's  
Church-Yard.



